



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,392	12/16/2003	Julia Y. Larikova	02495.000058.	7630
67763 7590 12/03/2008 FITZPATRICK CELLA (TELLABS) 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112-3800				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, TUNG X				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2829				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/737,392

Applicant(s)

LARIKOVA ET AL.

Examiner

TUNG X. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-10, 21-22, 26-27, and 35-45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-10, 21-22, 26-27, and 35-45 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6-10, 21-22, 26-27, 35-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leas et al. (u.s.p 5,600,257 heretoafter Leas), in view of Ishikawa (u.s.p 4,891,577)

As to claims 6, 8, 40 Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, a method for testing a component semiconductor, the method comprising steps of:

Providing a golden electrical component (32) that generates signals having known characteristic;

non-frangibly connecting the component (DUT 34) to a probe (21);

non-frangibly connecting the probe (54) to the golden electrical component (32);

Transmitting a electrical signal from the golden electrical component (32) to the component (DUT 34); and

Identifying a response by the component to the electrical signal (col. 2, lines 22-28, as shown in Figs. 1-2).

Adjusting the electrical signal (via 140).

Leas is silent about the high-frequency probe for testing the DUT, wherein the DUT is the optical component.

However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Chan, and replace the high-frequency probe, as taught by Ishikawa for contacting the device under test to transmit high frequency signals.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the DUT including the optical component.

As to claims 7, 43, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, evaluating the response by optical component (col. 2, lines 22-28, as shown in Fig. 1).

As to claims 9, 41, 44, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, evaluating (via 58) of the response by the optical component comprises determining if the optical component responds in substantially the same manner as a golden optical component would respond to a substantially equivalent electrical signal (as shown in Figs. 1-2).

As to claims 10, 42, 45, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the evaluating (via 58) of the response by the optical component comprises comparing the response by the optical component to a response by a golden optical component to a substantially equivalent electrical signal (as shown in Figs. 1-2).

As to claims 21-22, 39, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, identifying (evaluating 58) a response by the optical component to the adjusted electrical signal (as shown in Figs. 1-5).

As to claim 26, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the providing of a golden electrical component (32) comprises providing an electrical component (140) that operates according to product application requirements (34).

As to claims 27, 35 Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the golden electrical component (32) is located on an application PCB (90).

As to claim 36, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the golden electrical component is a golden PCB (90) having at least one component (32) that generates signals having known characteristics.

As to claims 37-38, Leas discloses in Figs. 1-7, the method comprising the steps of providing a golden printed circuit board having golden components that generate signals having know characteristic;

non-frangibly connecting the component (DUT 34) to a probe (21);

non-frangibly connecting the probe (54) to the golden PCB (90);

Transmitting a electrical signal from the golden PCB (90) to the component (DUT 34); and

Identifying a response by the component to the electrical signal (col. 2, lines 22-28, as shown in Figs. 1-2).

Adjusting the electrical signal (via 140).

Leas is silent about the high-frequency probe for testing the DUT, wherein the DUT is the optical component.

However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Chan, and replace the high-

frequency probe, as taught by Ishikawa for contacting the device under test to transmit high frequency signals.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the DUT including the optical component.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that Leas in view of Ishikawa teach away from using non-frangible connection.

In the response, the Examiner disagrees the issue above by the following reasons:

As clearly shown in Figs. 1 of the Leas' reference, the DUT (wafer 18) positioned between the test DUT (30) with the test head support (24), and the DUT support (28). Furthermore, the DUT covered by the test housing (12) that protected the DUT during testing. Therefore, Leas discloses using non-frangible connection.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TUNG X. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha T. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. X. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2829

/Ha T. Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2829